



Center for Slavic and East European Studies

University of California  
Berkeley, California  
94720

# Newsletter

Winter, 1994  
Vol. 8 No. 2

## Notes From the Chair

See page 4 for a talk with Gregory Grossman of the Department of Economics on the elections, the economic situation in Russia, the Russian mafia and more.

Our area of study, the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, has come to resemble a kaleidoscope. With each new turn of events, patterns appear to change—forming different shapes, combinations, and constellations with varying degrees of coherence. The recent strong showing in the Russian elections by Vladimir Zhirinovskiy raises the specter of neofascism developing in that country. We have already seen widespread intercommunal violence, civil war and interstate warfare in southern regions of Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. Yet, when we turn our kaleidoscope and focus on the northwest, we witness developments that inspire greater hope for a more stable, democratic and prosperous future. Turning our eye toward intermediate locations, we can only wonder in which direction such countries as Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, Bulgaria, and Romania will tilt.

These evolving patterns of differentiation challenge us to make sense of unformed realities. During 1994 the Center will sponsor many public events geared toward this goal. Here are a few that are currently in the planning stages: our Annual Outreach Conference will be organized around the theme of differential patterns of development in the post-Communist world. In addition, we will explore the evolving international associations and alliances being developed by the states

of the former Warsaw Pact, including their growing ties with East Asia. In a similar vein, a workshop will be held on the evolution of formerly Soviet Central Asia and its increasing interrelationship with the Middle East and Southwest Asia. Also, we have planned an overview of the modern Slavic World to be discussed in a half-day "Discover Cal" program for UC Berkeley donors at International House. Finally, together with IIS and the Center for German and European Studies, we are organizing for this spring a seminar comparing contemporary Russia with Weimar Germany.

We hope these and the many other events sponsored by the Center will quench your thirst for knowledge about this region of the world. It is our honor and pleasure to generate and disseminate such knowledge, however discomforting some of the news may be. In the spirit of the New Year, however, let us hope for the best.

On behalf of all of us here at the Center,  
I wish you the very happiest 1994.

—George W. Breslauer  
Chair of the Center

PROCESSED

JUN 08 2006

STU LIBRARY



# News From the Berkeley-Stanford Program

The "October events" in Moscow, the chaotic character of the "pre-election" campaign that followed, and the results of the December 12 elections have reminded the world that democratic consolidation in Russia is far from certain. Not only Russian society but the peoples of the other Soviet successor states confront profound problems and continue to be under enormous stress. As a result, inter-state war, the spread of ethnic violence, the rise and internationalization of organized crime, and public support for aggressive nationalism, genuine fascism, or communist revanchism remain serious threats. Moreover, it seems unlikely that these threats will ameliorate rapidly over the coming decade.

Against this background, the Berkeley-Stanford Program continues to promote research and graduate training in a field that is itself undergoing extremely rapid change in response to the ongoing drama of the Soviet collapse. Indeed, we have had a very active fall. In addition to our outreach efforts aimed at keeping the public informed through public presentations, publications, and media appearances by faculty and students, we organized a major conference at the Berkeley and Stanford campuses in mid-November to discuss the state of Russia's transition-in-process. As described by graduate student Andrew Lynch in the accompanying article, leading scholars from both the Russian Federation and the U.S. discussed topics such as public reaction in Russia to the October events, popular support for different political forces, relations between the federal government and the regions, the new constitution, and ethnic tensions.

Disagreements between participants were sharp. Some supported Yeltsin, his actions of October 3-4, and his new constitution, while others, to say the least, did not. Likewise, some argued that the interests of the ethnic republics and minority peoples of Russia were being trampled on by Moscow, while others opposed efforts to afford special rights and privileges to particular minorities and defended the prerogatives of the federal government. For those interested, a detailed summary of these and related discussions that took place earlier during three days of meetings at Stanford is being edited by BSP students Corbin Lyday, Andrew Lynch, and Lucan Way. The report will be available by early February, and can be ordered by mail from BSP or by calling 510-643-6737.

BSP was also fortunate this past fall to have Professor Donna Bahry of the University of California at Davis as a visiting professor in political science. Professor Bahry, a specialist on the regional political economy of the former Soviet Union, taught a course titled, "The Dynamics of Soviet and Post-Soviet Politics." She also led an extremely interesting graduate seminar series that reviewed

and analyzed ongoing survey research projects in Russia and the other successor states. The series brought Dr. Steven Grant from the U.S. Information Agency, Professor William Zimmerman from the University of Michigan, and Professor Cynthia Kaplan from UC-Santa Barbara to BSP for discussions with our graduate students and faculty.

This coming spring, BSP and the UC-Berkeley Department of Political Science are co-sponsoring a visiting research and teaching appointment by Dr. Andrei Melville, head of the newly-formed Department of Political Science at the Moscow State Institute of International Relations. Dr. Melville will be returning to Berkeley, having taught here previously in the spring of 1992. We look forward to hearing his views on the tense political situation in Moscow as well as on the development of political science in Russia.

As our schedule gets firmed up we will of course let the BSP community know about upcoming events. Please contact our office should you wish to be added to our mailing list to receive notices of upcoming events and a copy of our newsletter, *Khronika*. Finally, welcome back to our graduate students and faculty members. I hope this term is as interesting—but less hectic—than the last.

—Edward W. Walker

Executive Director, Berkeley-Stanford Program  
in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies

## Post-Communist Nationalism, Ethnicity and Conflict In the Russian Federation

Ethno-nationalist tensions present the most troubling and persistent problems facing the post-Cold-War world. For Russia in particular, with its ethnic diversity, 21 ethnically-defined republics and 10 districts, and diaspora in the "near abroad," ethnic tensions are seriously complicating the ongoing socio-political transformation.

A series of conferences, held at Stanford and UC Berkeley on November 11-12 and 15-16, brought visiting scholars from the Russian Federation together with local scholars from the Berkeley-Stanford Program in Soviet and Post-Soviet Studies, the Center for Slavic and East European Studies, the Center for International Security and Arms Control, and the Stanford Center on Conflict and Negotiation to discuss these issues. The conferences were especially timely because they took place only weeks after the October 3-4 showdown between Yeltsin and Parliament, but prior to the December 12 elections and referendum on Russia's new constitution.

While theoretical issues framed discussions to some



extent, substantive presentations by participants from Tuva, Sakha-Yakutia, Tatarstan and North Ossetia, as well as from Moscow, provided a rich substantive context. The wide-ranging discussions dealt with the particular internal difficulties resulting from each ethnic republic's history, resources and local ethnic Russian minority. In the case of North Ossetia, for example, it was suggested that the various local ethnicities may in fact share customs and traditions which could aid in local conflict resolution. This republic-focused research is part of a survey project, discussed in Friday's session, which seeks a better understanding of ethnic conflict in the Russian Federation as a whole. Leokadia Drobizheva, from the Institute of Ethnology in Moscow, presented the project and draft questionnaire for discussion at Friday's session, and additional perspectives on ethnic tensions were given on Monday and Tuesday, specifically concerning public peace processes and the nature of ethnic conflict and actual violence in Russia and the "near abroad."

Moscow politics formed the other vital dimension of workshop discussions. In this respect Drobizheva's project was mostly concerned with the revised formal status of republics in the newly-drafted constitution, but the workshops as a whole also considered the broader, ongoing drama around the constitutional foundation of, and actual power balance within, the Russian state. Galina Starovoitova, former adviser to President Yeltsin on ethnic relations, provided an invaluable Moscow perspective on both federal issues and Moscow politics in general on the eve of the constitutional referendum and elections. While Starovoitova is fairly confident that Russia's transition will continue without major conflict, she did express concern that democracy-supporting forces may fractionate while nationalist/populist forces remain united.

Other participants voiced similar fears of a split among all political parties along nationalist/international lines, or that Yeltsin's actions themselves represent fresh movement toward a "new authoritarianism" since the events of October. While Russian public opinion research, as presented by Lev Gudkov of the Center for the Study of Public Opinion in Moscow, shows widespread support for Yeltsin's recent actions, the internal balance of political power remains precarious, despite, or perhaps because of, Yeltsin's banning of many opposition parties and newspapers.

Only time will reveal the significance and impact of the events in Russia in October-December 1993, but on balance, there seemed to be more optimism than pessimism among workshop participants. Republic representatives expressed more concern with receiving respect from

Moscow than with their formal status, and the Moscow perspective, though characterized by strong pessimism among a few participants, seemed to reflect a general confidence that the situation will slowly and painfully stabilize despite continued turbulence and many potential dangers.

Reported by Andrew Lynch. A conference report on the proceedings is forthcoming.



### **Buxbaum Appointed Dean of International and Area Studies**

Extracted from *The Berkeleyan*

Professor Richard Buxbaum, founder of the campus's Center for German and European Studies, is the new dean of International and Area Studies. Buxbaum, 63, succeeds Albert Fishlow, who became the first dean in 1989.

International and Area Studies is an umbrella organization charged with linking and expanding 33 units at Berkeley concerned with international affairs and enlarging the campus's international contributions and visibility in the United States and abroad. Remarking on Buxbaum's appointment, Vice Chancellor John Heilbron said that "international and area studies are a big priority on the Berkeley campus. We are very lucky to have Professor Buxbaum as their overseer. He is a man of wide experience, international outlook, and diplomatic manner." As the Jackson Ralston Professor of International Law at Boalt Hall, Buxbaum's areas of specialization are corporate law, international and European economic law, and international business transactions.

Professor Buxbaum is an affiliated faculty member of the Slavic Center.





## An Economist Views Russia's Plight: Gregory Grossman on the Pre- and Post-Election Period

*Gregory Grossman, professor emeritus of economics, joined the UC Berkeley faculty in 1953. His pioneering work in the field of Soviet-type economics provided the profession with badly-needed ground rules for working with distorted Soviet statistics, as well as with a theoretical framework in which to put them.*

*The Award for Distinguished Contributions to Slavic Studies, given to him at the 1991 convention by the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies, reads in part: "...you developed the concepts, systematized the attributes, and defined and popularized the terms 'Command Economy' and 'Second Economy.' These terms became an essential part of the lexicon of economics, and in the 1960s the concepts came to be accepted even by Soviet economists."*

*Professor Grossman is the author of several books, among them the seminal Soviet Statistics of Physical Output of Industrial Commodities (Princeton University Press, 1960); and his text, Economic Systems (Prentice-Hall, 1967). He has often been asked to give expert testimony before Congress and is noted for his diligent, untiring service to the professional, as well as to the larger, community. In the 1950s, he helped to reorganize the Slavic Center and served as its Chair in the early 1960s.*

**AH:** Let's begin with the recent elections. How do you think that Yeltsin and his new government should proceed to stabilize the economy?

**GG:** I wish I could give you a satisfactory answer.

**AH:** I was afraid you'd say that.

**GG:** The reaction of Gaidar and his closest colleagues has been that the results of the elections are a signal to resolve the inconsistencies of government policy to date, to get back on course with a very tough reform program and to push it in a much more consistent way. I think basically they are right. But judging from recent events, it doesn't seem to be their lot to proceed. Yeltsin has had to find scapegoats, and Gaidar and Federov are the most obvious.

Now, if Yeltsin and his new economic managers move in the direction the public seems to have in mind, inflation will continue. Along with inflation some other things will also continue. To begin with, a continuing drop in personal income, pushing ever more people into poverty. A number of other people will see their incomes continue to rise, and social differentiation will increase. The latter is a consequence of hyperinflation and of the nature of the regime.

Also, it is difficult to see how easing what is undoubtedly a terrible burden on the people could significantly improve the economy. Additional subsidies from both the treasury and the bank will only make matters worse, because sooner or later, industries that are white elephants must be disposed of. And after a longer period of subsidies, the job will be harder. There may be a return to more military production, if only for reasons of subsidy. And additional

---

**If Gaidar has his way and cuts subsidies sharply, the West should start thinking seriously about support for the Russian safety net, making the inevitable unemployment and relocations less drastic. Whole cities of 1,000,000 or more population...will find themselves without an economic base.**

---

military procurement will not be particularly soothing to the world at large.

**AH:** Do you think agricultural subsidies are a good idea?

**GG:** The present trend toward private ownership of farms may be reversed. The conservative agricultural parties, primarily the local agricultural bosses and rural *nomenklatura*, have a chunk of votes in Parliament now. And their votes are important to all sides. The neo-communists count on them, the fascists may count on them, and Yeltsin counts on them. So, with the agrarian conservative bloc there may well be a reversal of policy regarding private ownership of farms and continued subsidization of the old giant farms.

What we may see is a speeding up of inflation, not only for inherent reasons, but also because of the public's expectations. We can expect the ruble price of hard currency to rise. This will, in part, help Russia by protecting domestic industry, but it will have many other effects. It will speed up the flight of capital and it may very well lead to price control, which will turn Russia in the direction of the old system, because price control leads to administrative allocation of goods, with the market no longer doing that job. It is a step not only in a populist direction, but in the direction of the old command economy.

**AH:** How effectively can Russia dictate to its republics and regions on questions of price controls?

**GG:** Not very effectively, which may mean that some of these functions will be decentralized, as indeed they have



been to some degree since January 1992.

**AH:** Which of Russia's republics and regions would you say are in the best shape, relatively speaking?

**GG:** I'd say probably those republics in the East and in the West that can benefit from cross-border trade, much of it illegal. Also those republics which have managed to maintain production of consumer goods and are able to take advantage of the high prices of such goods. The energy producers are in potentially good shape, if energy prices are further brought up. The republics that will fare badly will be the former republics of the USSR now outside Russia; there will be a tendency to isolate them, to let them fend for themselves. They have a lot to fear.

**AH:** If I were the leader of a largely ethnic republic, I wouldn't be thrilled at the prospect of trading with an entity that has put a Zhirinovsky in the picture.

**GG:** If Zhirinovsky wields power then obviously all of them will be wary—even those within Russia.

**AH:** As to international trade, Yeltsin recently signed a declaration aimed at improving relations with the European community, a first step toward an economic partnership. What effect, if any, will the elections have on these negotiations?

**GG:** Well, the only way that trade between, let's say Russia, and the West can significantly rise in the near future is by major economic and financial support from the West. Energy exports now play an even greater role in the balance of payments than they played before the collapse of the USSR, in part because there is less to export, in part because of the loss of the other republics, and in part because of the troubles. But energy production in Russia is falling rapidly. Oil production for the last several years has been falling 10% a year. Even gas production, and gas was the success story of Gorbachev's last years, has leveled off and started to decline. Coal production has also declined sharply and has been affected by labor unrest.

There are two reasons, neither hopeful for the future, why Russia has so far been able to continue exporting oil. First, with the drop in the economy, domestic demand has decreased. Oil production has dropped on the order of 25%, and so has the economy. Therefore, much of the fuel that would normally have been burned by Russian industry has not been. Second, Russia used to export energy to Eastern Europe and to the republics of the USSR at very low prices. Eastern Europe, which used to take about half of Russia's oil exports, has now entirely stopped importing from Russia, and that oil has moved to the hard currency market. There is also more pressure on the former Soviet

republics to pay hard currency or take less oil and gas.

Further, Russia has been hard hit by the sharp drop of oil prices on the world market. This is very significant because Russia depends almost entirely on energy exports and continues to use the proceeds to buy food. The prospects for agriculture are not good. It would take a long time for privatization to pay off, and with the consequences of the election, one wonders how they are going to buy fodder, equipment, and the other agricultural imports from the West that they are heavily dependent on.

**AH:** How should the West proceed?

**GG:** That depends on the circumstances. If Gaidar has his way and cuts subsidies sharply, the West should start thinking seriously about support for the Russian safety net, making the inevitable unemployment and relocations less drastic. Whole cities of 1,000,000 or more population, perhaps whole regions, will find themselves without an economic base. But this kind of support would be hard to sell to the American and other Western people. Can you imagine spending billions on Russian unemployed given our own serious social problems?

**AH:** And Europe is not in any better shape.

**GG:** Exactly. However, if a post-Gaidar, Zhirinovsky-influenced program goes into effect, we will, of course, be much less willing to help Russia at all.

**AH:** Given the fact that the West has not been overly generous until now, maybe the Russians figure it's a moot point.

**GG:** You have a non-moot point there! That is very true, though I would not want to exaggerate the West's ability to make a difference.

**AH:** To step back in time for a moment, I'd like to find out more about the inconsistencies in government policy you mentioned. You have said, "It's a poor economist who overlooks the political side of his coin." Would you flip the coin a couple of times and give us an idea of what Yeltsin, Gaidar and Chernomyrdin have been attempting to do and why their attempts have failed?

**GG:** The three have had, I think, somewhat different policies in this regard and certainly different objectives, if not values. Gaidar is the economist; I think it is fair to call him a professional economist. He is a highly dynamic personality, probably with a touch of authoritarianism in him. He tends to know what he wants and how to get there. Yeltsin has been somewhat sphinx-like, sitting above it all, having to juggle a wide-ranging and frequently incom-



patible set of interests, prejudices, etc. Chernomyrdin came from one of the largest economic conglomerates. As head of the gas industry he is a man of the economic *nomenklatura*. He cut his teeth on the old system, but he also seems to have a good deal of flexibility. It has been remarkable to me the extent to which he has been able to

---

**...many people started speculating against those prices; or, to put it in somewhat different terms, started a run on energy. By this attitude they in fact considerably aggravated inflation in all other prices.**

---

work with the reformers and the reformers have been able to work with him. At the time he was appointed a year ago, I feared that things would not go smoothly: the three have very different ideas, backgrounds and objectives.

As for Gaidar, he was brought in by Gorbachev to perform what has been labelled in the world and in Russia as "shock therapy." I thought from the start that this is terrible public relations; it should have been called something perhaps with an old Slavic name—something sufficiently vague and indefinite to be misunderstood by everyone! I'm being facetious. But what is more, shock therapy was not really pursued. It lasted at most only four months. Gaidar was appointed in October, 1991, and on October 28, 1991, Yeltsin gave a speech on the economy in which he laid down essentially what the policy was going to be, pulling only a small number of punches.

**AH:** Could you specify briefly for us what the policy was?

**GG:** It was to be a policy of stabilization of the ruble, of money, without which no normal economy is possible. It was a policy that would impose temporary austerity on the country. There would be appropriate action in the fiscal, monetary and international arenas. It was clear that reform, or if you wish, transition, was being given a strong push, and it was also clear that the October 28th speech, if not entirely written by Gaidar, had fundamental input from him. It is possible, of course, that even at that time Yeltsin was in some respects holding Gaidar back, but basically it was Gaidar's program. And so, just over two months later, on January 2, 1992, the first and to my mind inevitable step took place: the de-control of prices. Suddenly, prices, which had been going up by a kind of ratchet mechanism operated by the old administrators rather than by the market, were thrown open for the market to determine. Note that private savings had been already largely wiped out by the pre-1992 administrative price increases.

Now to put it this way is to overstate somewhat. This price control reserved a good number of exceptions for essential consumer goods: bread, housing rents, things like that. In the producer goods sector an exception of really enormous significance was made, in that the whole energy sector would continue to have its prices held down and controlled. This exception with regard to energy prices, and I don't know if it was Gaidar's idea or was imposed on him by Yeltsin, was, a big mistake in retrospect. It is true that there would have been more of a hue and cry had energy prices been liberalized, but because of the enormous jump in prices over a matter of days and weeks, there was such outrage that the additional hue and cry would probably have been lost in the overall noise.

In regard to pre-1992 Russian wholesale prices, energy prices were extremely low by any standard, certainly with regard to the world market. This meant that there was a major indirect subsidy to at least four entities in the country. One was the consumers, who use fuel for heating and cooking, etc. Second, it was also a sop, if you wish, to energy-using industries, including farming—and, by the way, had energy prices been released, food and farm prices would also have had to go up, which obviously would have hurt consumers. Third, most of the republics outside of Russia were already being heavily subsidized, and now continued to be, since a large part of the subsidy was the concealed subsidy in the extremely low prices of energy charged them.

And here we come to the fourth entity, the state budget, which would have found it much harder to make ends meet. And that of course was an important consideration! For many years, you see, the state budget had been buying domestic energy very cheaply for its own use and to sell abroad. On the eve of shock therapy, energy sales provided well over half the hard currency that the country earned, and contributed a very significant amount to the revenue side of the state budget.

**AH:** So they were obviously very aware of tinkering with that.

**GG:** Yes. But there were two big flaws in that thinking: one was that the country, and especially the sharper people who were beginning to work for their own profit or advantage, realized that energy prices could not remain low for long, especially with all the other prices going up like mad. They foresaw that sooner or late the state would have to release them. And so many people started speculating against those prices; or to put it in somewhat different terms, started a run on energy. By this attitude they in fact considerably aggravated inflation in all other prices.

**AH:** Economics is a tricky field...



**GG:** Very tricky, and the only thing that is trickier are the economists themselves! The second flaw in their thinking was not to realize in what way this subsidy would affect the cost of production and the utilization of energy. On one hand low energy prices caused people to continue to waste energy. And on the other, the energy-producing sectors were stuck with low prices and therefore short of money for wages, etc. So this led to the strikes in the coal industry and some other energy industries.

Note that shock therapy lasted for only four months in 1992. In April, seemingly under orders from Yeltsin, who had come under immense pressure, some prices were released, including energy to some degree. Equally important, the green light was given for both the state treasury and the central bank, at that time not yet headed by Gerashchenko to start handing out subsidies right and left, in order to calm down the country. Now it is true that during those four months, and particularly during the first four weeks after January 1, prices did shoot up much more than expected. There are at least three or four explanations why they did, some mutually inconsistent.

There were also some specific and peculiar reactions on the part of the enterprise sector, which went on heedlessly raising prices on the assumption that their customers would not have to pay them in the end. They were responsible for what came to be known in 1992 as the crisis of non-payment. Nobody paid, except sometimes in kind. Quite a few barter transactions occurred, and bricks and cement became a new kind of money.

So people could nominally raise prices, asserting their claim for more, sometime in the future. To some extent they were correct, because eventually the state, specifically the central bank, stepped in and to a considerable degree bailed them out.

**AH:** So the enterprises called their bluff...

**GG:** Yes, they called their bluff. When these subsidies were handed out in April 1992, several major advisors to the Russian government, such as Anders Oslen of Sweden, Jeffery Sachs of the United States, and Richard Layard of Britain lambasted the government for abandoning shock therapy. Now the Russians are being faulted for maintaining shock therapy to the very day of the election.

**AH:** What was Chernomyrdin's role in all this?

**GG:** When he first came on board, it wasn't clear what his role was to be. Perhaps it's still not very clear. As has been the case for centuries, things in the Kremlin happen behind closed doors. Chernomyrdin himself has been rather reserved. But if he represented any segment of industry it

was the less conservative class of managers. He did go along with a lot of things that the more conservative of the managers would not for a moment condone. So if Yeltsin had to find someone to act as a barrier between his bright young economist with radical ideas and the country at large, he did not do so badly to my mind. Chernomyrdin

---

**I would say that nothing serious can be done without returning to a base of domestic currency, and this is the primary rationale for a Gaidar-like reform. You can't do anything unless you have usable money.**

---

was, in a sense, covering Yeltsin and Gaidar, and he had the authority and clout to do it—the stature of a CEO of General Motors or of IBM.

**AH:** You said at one point that until the legal underpinnings of private business are secured, private money will continue to shun longterm investment. Has that proven to be true? What is the legal situation in Russia?

**GG:** Well, the legal situation is not very good. As to the constitution, a lot of basic laws for individual sectors, for individual branches of the government, for relations between parts of the total political and economic structure at the highest levels, are still not in place. Some are not even drawn up. Many laws governing day-to-day activities, such as contracts, laws for the financial sphere, and especially the banking sphere, are a terrible mess. There *are* laws but they are far from satisfactory, and what is less satisfactory is the incompetence of the banks to handle this task.

**AH:** Is there a structure in place to oversee things?

**GG:** Not really. Many of the banks, and especially ones with the largest capital and resources, are captive or kept banks. They are closely associated with one or the other of the branches of industry and were created for the purpose of helping enterprises to get money when they need it in these difficult times. Technically, as well as in terms of business management and economics, the banks operate at a low level. It takes months and months for a very simple payment to be made. Sometimes money simply gets lost in the system and nobody knows where the papers are.

Another problem the banks have is that between the banks of the former republics of the Soviet Union there is now an additional barrier: the state boundary, so that Russia deals with them as foreign banks. Just about every financial



aspect of the Russian situation looks bad. Much of the problem, of course has to do with the carry-over of the disabilities and defects of the old Soviet system.

AH: You've also said it is likely that the cartels will continue to run things, although in new configurations. Is that what you see happening?

GG: I would call it a non-negligible possibility. I don't insist that the probability is high, but it is a possibility. If regionally-oriented or anti-reform-oriented or populistically-oriented forces come to the foreground, the probability increases. Because then these agglomerations of industrial power, which are already operating as laws unto themselves will simply take over, to ensure the continuation of production or maintain stability. If a dictator of a popular sort emerges, then this sort of "corporatism" is likely, as has been true of other populist dictatorships.

As I intimated, it's hard to see any good way out. I would say that nothing serious can be done without returning to a base of domestic currency, and this is the primary rationale for a Gaidar-like reform. You can't do anything unless you have usable money. So if you proceed from that premise, then anti-inflationary austerity measures are essential. Then the main question is how to cope with the suffering of the people. Here the solution is probably to decentralize as much as possible to the regional level, not because the regions will necessarily handle things better, but because they are closer to the source of the problems and have a greater stake in solving them. At the same time work must proceed on measures that do not promise quick success but that cannot be postponed, such as building a legal and institutional framework for a private economy.

A greater effort toward establishing a safety net internally, walking the fine line between being taken to the cleaners and not doing enough, is also essential. If the elections are any indication, they have been erring on the side of not doing enough. And by the way, the worst-off group in the country is not the pensioners, but those working poor, mostly in the state sector, who don't have side incomes. What is striking is how nearly everyone is hustling.

AH: Do people have any choice except to hustle?

GG: Not much. It's a sad and at the same time hopeful indication.

AH: Did you read the *Image* piece [Andrew Meier, *San Francisco Chronicle*, 12/5/93] on the Russian mafia?

GG: Yes, I read that.

AH: As an expert on Russia's second economy, a term you

coined many years ago for the various legal and illegal underground activities in the Soviet Union, would you comment on the mafia as it exists in Russia today?

GG: Well, the article rings true. I hope the author was writing under a *nom de plume*! I have done some reading by serious Russian writers on the subject: people in the research institutes of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and others working in places where they study such things. The mafia is highly organized in Russia and in the republics. There may be as many as 1,500 groups joined into a few hundred coalitions, or conglomerates.

In each case, on both the lower and higher level, there is usually a Godfather-type figure. Some writers believe that the situation would be better with fewer and stronger Godfathers. What you see now are violent battles over turf. These battles do not mean that the mafia is being contained, only that it has not yet organized itself. Once it has organized itself, at least for ordinary people life may be much calmer, as it has traditionally been in Sicily and New York.

AH: But at what cost?

GG: At a very great economic, social and political cost, of course. But at least then the government would know with whom to deal.

AH: It's a sad prospect that that's perhaps the best we can hope for at the moment. Let's move to the calmer water of the University.

GG: Calmer waters?!

AH: Relatively speaking. The career of a young economist and academic working in the area of Eurasian studies today is bound to take a different shape from the career that you and your colleagues have had. What are the advantages for young scholars starting out today?

GG: The possibilities and opportunities are beyond the wildest dreams of my generation. First I should describe a little of my experience. Remember that for a good part of my generation's career, one couldn't even *get into* that country. And once you got in, you couldn't do anything. Then, you could go back there and confirm that you couldn't do anything! But even under such tight Stalinist and KGB-controlled conditions, getting into the country was very important, just to see and smell the place.

AH: You were born in Kiev. How old were you when you left?

GG: I was one year old and seventeen when I came to the



U.S. I first returned to the USSR in 1960, fortunate enough to travel with one of the first American academic groups. We travelled over much of the country for a whole month. What was often interesting to me was to escape my Soviet chaperones and get lost in the crowd. If you stood in a line in front of some store, you could pick up lots of conversation and learn more than you could possibly learn through reading or interviewing.

To answer your question, the opportunities for the present generation are fabulous. But they do face difficulties, which vary from university to university and from discipline to discipline. One problem is that the academic world may be less interested in their field than it used to be, or that interest may not be backed up by money. When departments take the position of lesser interest, I believe they are making a mistake, because I can't think of anything more professionally fruitful for an economist or other social scientist today to study than what is going on now in Russia and Eastern Europe—and what will be going on for some time.

However, there are compensating developments. International organizations are increasingly important sources of jobs. The danger here, I think, is that when they begin to cut back their programs they will flood the market with people who will have a very hard time finding other, especially teaching, jobs. And, of course, another problem is the declining financial condition of academia, especially in California. To put the situation in perspective, in a typical major department of economics in the 1950s, the study of the Soviet world might have been priority number five, but the department planned to hire fifteen people over four to five years. So somebody got hired. Now the post-Soviet world is priority number fifteen and the department may plan to hire only five people over the next five years! Those hired then have retired or are retiring now. Not all will be replaced, though there is no dearth of fine specialists on the Russian, CIS, and East-Central European economies.

AH: Would you like to conclude on a more positive note?

GG: If I may paraphrase Horace Greeley: Go East young scholar! It will be full of misery and even horror for a good time yet, but its intellectual frontiers are unsurpassed. □





## Riasanovsky Honored

On November 18, 1993, former students, with colleagues from the Department of History and the Slavic Center, gathered at the Faculty Club to honor Professor Nicholas Riasanovsky on the occasion of his 70th birthday.

He was presented with a *Festschrift* by his former students and a beautifully-bound collection of his essays, as well as a leatherbound copy of the fifth edition of his text, *A History of Russia*, contributed by Oxford University Press.

Professor Riasanovsky was also honored at the November 1993 meeting of the AAASS in Hawaii with the Award for Distinguished Contributions to Slavic Studies. The text of the award follows: "The American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies is pleased to honor you with this award in recognition of the many outstanding contributions you have made to our field during your long years of professional service and intellectual achievement. Widely acknowledged as a true pioneer in the field of Russian intellectual history, you have introduced thousands of young people to the study of Russia's history and culture through your outstanding textbook, *A History of Russia* (1963), now in its fifth revised edition. Your superb studies of such topics as official nationality, images of Peter the Great, and the teachings of the Slavophiles have left their mark on the thinking and writing of many leading scholars. Your insightful books and articles on not only Russian but also West European intellectual history retain their value with time and continue to be read in America and abroad.

"Your scholarly achievement is matched by the quality and quantity of your service to the profession. Within our Association, you have served as president, on the board of directors, and on many other AAASS bodies. Your contributions to our field have included service to such important organizations as the National Council for Soviet and East European Research. You were a founding editor of *California Slavic Studies* and an invaluable member of the editorial boards of *The Russian Review* and other major journals. Your reputation as a humane and inspiring teacher is unsurpassed, and you are known for the fairness and good judgment that you bring to difficult and complex situations, 'keeping your head when all about you are losing theirs.'

"At the University of California, which you have served in many capacities, your colleagues have recognized your achievements by awarding you the Sidney Hellman Ehrman Chair in European History, and your former students have recently honored you with a splendid *Festschrift*.

"For all your impressive accomplishments, for the

grace and civility with which you have shared with us your profound knowledge, and for the wisdom that you have brought to your profession and our field, the American Association for the Advancement of Slavic Studies is proud to present you with this richly deserved award."

## Announcements

We are proud to report that two of our graduate students, Rob Darst (Political Science) and Veljko Vujacic (Sociology), were recently named Harvard Academy Scholars at the Harvard Academy for International and Area Studies. These awards, also known as the Kukin scholarships after Dr. Ira Kukin, founding benefactor of the Harvard Academy, are very competitive. Congratulations!

Congratulations as well to Professor Reginald Zelnik, Department of History, who has been awarded an IREX grant to support a conference on workers and the intelligentsia in Russia in the late 19th- and early 20th-centuries.



## Fellowships and Other Opportunities for Support

The American Council of Learned Societies offers East European Language Training Grants for applicants who will use the languages in academic or other professional careers. Contact: ACLS, 228 East 45th Street, New York NY 10017-3398; (212) 697-1505. The application deadline is **MARCH 1, 1994**.

**American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) Fellowships for East European Studies.** Graduate pre-dissertation travel and language study grants are available. Contact: ACLS, 228 East 45th Street, New York, NY 10017-3398; 212/697-1505. The application deadline is **MARCH 1, 1994**.

The International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX) announces opportunities for support of collaborative Special Projects in the study of Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia. Proposal from all disciplines in the humanities and social sciences are welcome. Projects must involve American and non-American participants from the above regions, as well as at least one American and one foreign Project Organizer. Contact: IREX, Special Projects/(Central and Eastern Europe) or (Eurasia), 1616 H Street, N.W., Washington DC 20006; (202) 628-8188; fax: (202) 628-8189; e-mail: irex@gwuvm.gwu.edu The application deadline is **MARCH 1, 1994**.



**The Library of Congress Junior Fellows Program:** European Division awards fellowships to college juniors, seniors, and graduate students with an interest in working on Library projects, including several related to Russian and Soviet studies. Contact: Dr. Michael Haltzel, Chief, European Division, Library of Congress, Washington DC 20540. (202) 707-5414.

**MONA (The Foundation of the Women of Hungary)** provides internship positions for a duration of three to six months for women and men interested in acquiring knowledge of women's issues in Hungary as well as experience in foundation organizing. MONA will provide a monthly stipend of 10,000 HUF. Please contact MONA for more information: Tatra u. 30/b, 1136 Budapest, Hungary. Tel/Fax: (36-1) 120-1115.

Graduate fellowships are available under the **National Security Education Program**, a newly established federally-funded program. Targeted world areas have yet to be determined; criteria will include their importance to national security and to competitiveness. Among the conditions for receiving a NSEF graduate fellowship will be potential government service following the tenure of the fellowship. Contact: The Academy for Educational Development, NSEF Graduate Fellowships, Universal North Building, 1875 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington DC 20009-1202; 1-800-498-9360; fax: (202) 884-8400. The application deadline is **MARCH 1, 1994**.

Because **Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty** is in the process of reorganization and relocation of its Research Institute outside of Germany, there will be no Summer Research Internship program offered in 1994. RFE/RL expects to reinstate this program in 1995.

**The Joint Committee on the Soviet Union and its Successor States (JCSSS)** of the Social Science Research Council announces a program of support for research and development initiatives. The program is designed to support meetings, conferences, workshops, and pilot projects. Research and Development Program, JCSSS, Social Science Research Council, 605 Third Avenue, New York NY 10158; (212) 661-0280. The application deadlines are **MARCH 1** and **SEPTEMBER 15, 1994**.

The Program on International Peace and Security of the Social Science Research Council announces a competition for grants to support small topical workshops in 1994. These grants are available for workshops on topics that test established assumptions about peace and security. Junior faculty and researchers are especially encouraged to apply. Contact: program in International Peace and Security, SSRC, 605 Third Avenue, NYC 10158; (212) 661-0280. The application deadline is **MARCH 7, 1994**.

**The MacArthur Interdisciplinary Group on International Security Studies (MIGISS)** announces **Dissertation Fellowships in Peace and Security**. Awards will be given to projects dealing with one or more of the following themes: regional conflict; population, resources and security; arms trade proliferation and conversion; technology, economic competitiveness and strategic policy; the domestic roots of international behavior; cooperation and international institutions. Proposals not falling under these categories, but which are concerned with issues of peace and security, will also be considered. **Eligibility:** UC Berkeley graduate students who are advanced to candidacy, or who have satisfied all requirements for the Ph.D. except the dissertation (by September 1, 1994). Contact the MacArthur Fellowship Coordinator, Institute of International Studies, 215 Moses Hall, campus. The application deadline is **APRIL 4, 1994**.

**The John L. Simpson Memorial Research Fellowships in International and Comparative Studies** are offered by the Institute for International Studies. The grants are awarded to support research in comparative studies that analyze similarities and differences among societies and states with respect to social, political, and economic structures and policies, as well as international studies analyzing relations among states, economies and societies. Suggested proposal topics include international economic issues; international security issues, international environmental issues, international demographic trends, and comparative development and change. The awards are for one year. **Eligibility:** UC Berkeley graduate students advanced to candidacy, or who have satisfied all requirements for the Ph.D. except the dissertation (by September 1, 1994). Contact: Fellowship coordinator, John L. Simpson Memorial Research Fellowship Program, Institute of International Studies, 215 Moses Hall, campus. The application deadline is **APRIL 4, 1994**.

**The Allan Sharlin Memorial Award** is made annually to a student who shows promise of advancing scholarship in the field of historical sociology, historical demography or social history. **Eligibility:** UC Berkeley graduate students advanced to candidacy by September 1, 1994. Contact: the Allan Sharlin Memorial Award Committee, Institute of International Studies, 215 Moses Hall, campus. The application deadline is **APRIL 4, 1994**.

**The MacArthur Interdisciplinary Group on International Security Studies (MIGISS)** announces the **Breadth Fellowship in Peace and Security**. This fellowship supports second- or third-year graduate students who wish to broaden the competence beyond their major discipline through course work related to the subjects of national security/foreign policy; and international conflict, peace and cooperation. **Eligibility:** UC Berkeley



# Library Report

## Funding received for Library Preservation

It is a rare library that manages to perform all its desired functions with only local fiscal resources at its disposal. The continued strength of a great library and a great collection is more often dependent on its success in tapping extramural resources for the completion of large, expensive projects. At Berkeley, we have managed over the years to garner our share of such grant funding, and a significant portion of it has been to support the Slavic Collections on campus.

It is with this preface that I am pleased to announce yet another successful grant application. The Library's Conservation Department has received \$1,321,042 for a two-year project to preserve portions of the Slavic collections that are deteriorating because of age. The grant was awarded by the National Endowment for the Humanities. Monies will be used to film approximately 10,000 volumes and repair another 4,000 items.

As you may or may not know, paper used in book and serial production during the final decades of the nineteenth century and the first quarter of the twentieth century contained acidic residues from the products used to make the paper appear white. Over time these residues destroy the structure of the paper until the book or serial turns into a flaking, brittle mess. Use of the material during this stage of deterioration often destroys the item and renders it unusable to future scholars.

Given the breadth and depth of Berkeley's Slavic collections, the Library owns many volumes from this period that are badly in need of preservation. To maintain a working copy for scholars in the future, these items must be preserved. The cost of such preservation is well beyond the state funds which the Library receives; thus the Berkeley library is extremely fortunate to have received funding for this far-reaching preservation effort.

There is another aspect of the preservation process also worthy of mention. Berkeley, of course, is not alone in receiving grant monies for preservation. There are major libraries all across the country engaged in similar preservation efforts. One of the stipulations placed on libraries receiving grant money is that they try not to duplicate each others' effort. The goal is to make scarce financial resources stretch as far as possible. Consequently, our library will film only titles that no other institution has previously preserved. There are national on-line computer databases in which libraries engaged in preservation efforts are obliged to register their claim to film a particular title. This registration satisfies the granting agency's requirement of avoiding duplication. It also serves to inform librarians and scholars that material important for

their research is available elsewhere.

Sincere thanks is due the members of the Library's Conservation Office who, through their years of experience and knowledge, have once again succeeded in obtaining funding for much-needed programs.

## And lest we overlook...

Though small in comparison, the Library is currently benefitting from the continuation of two other grant awards.

We are beginning the third year of a project that will convert all the Slavic collection's records from the traditional card format into the on-line catalog, GLADIS. Approximately \$250,000 will be spent in this final year of the project to complete an extremely necessary task. The new Doe-Moffitt underground complex is soon to be completed, and at that point the Author/Title card catalog, which now resides on the second floor of the Doe Library, will no longer be available. It is our great fortune to have received grant funding at the time we did. The language expertise required to convert Slavic collection records creates special staffing needs and grant funds are the only means available to add capable personnel.

Not to be lost among the large numbers is the \$9,000 received as a second installment from a Department of Education, Title-VI program for the expansion of foreign periodical holdings. With this money the Library was able to purchase a significant number of current Slavic serial subscriptions that are infrequently found in collections in the United States.

—Allan Urbanic  
Slavic Librarian

### Newsletter

of the Center for Slavic and East European Studies, University of California at Berkeley.  
361 Stephens Hall, University of California,  
Berkeley, CA 94720; phone 510/642-3230.

Editor: Anne Hawkins  
Phone: 510/642-9107

The *newsletter* is published quarterly during the academic year. Please send suggestions, corrections or inquiries to the editor at the above address. Submit mailing address changes to the Center, Attn.: Newsletter Mailing List; or call the Center at 510/642-3230.

©1994 by the Center for Slavic and East European Studies.



## Support for Hungarian Studies at UC Berkeley

The Center is extremely grateful to those who responded to our special request for assistance in the support of Hungarian Studies at Berkeley, following the visit of the Hungarian ambassador to the US, the Honorable Mr. Pal Tar. In connection with our 3:1 matching grant toward endowment from the Mellon Foundation, it was possible to earmark contributions for special purposes such as the program in Hungarian language and culture. Several donors recognized the unique importance of the program and took the opportunity to increase the value of their gifts. Those who were able to apply positively to our plea included Dr. Andrew DeGall, Mrs. Bettye Ferguson, Paul and Martha Hertelendy, and Nicholas and Catherine Molnar. Thank you all.

## ASC News

The Center acknowledges with sincere appreciation the following individuals who have contributed to the annual giving program of the Associates of the Slavic Center between August 15 and December 31, 1993. Financial support from the Associates is vital to our program of research, training, and extra curricular activities. We would like to thank all members of ASC for their generous assistance. (\*signifies gift of continuing membership; \*\*gift of continuing membership and a donation toward the Slavic Center Endowment)

## CENTER CIRCLE

Anonymous\*

Margit A. Hazarabedian

Pertti and Doris Lindfors\*\*

Ron and Shirley Maus\*\*

Drs. Michael and Irene Petroff\*\*

Serge and Jane Petroff\*\*

Michael Richards\*\*

Mr. and Mrs. George Weickhardt\*\*

## BENEFACTORS

Mr. and Mrs. Richard Heggie\*

Charles Hughes\*

## SPONSORS

Carol and Thomas Alexander\*\*

Jayne Watt Becker\*

Gary and Marilyn Hausladen\*

Arthur and Dorteia Hocker\*

Mr. and Mrs. John P. Macmeeken\*

John J. Macut\*

James E. McDavid\*

Chris Pedroncelli\*

Michele Rench\*

Anonymous\*

Alex and Dorothy Vucinich\*

Anonymous\*

## MEMBERS

Mr. and Mrs. Bart Benedict\*

Dr. and Mrs. George Blum\*

Gienia Bukowska\*

Melissa Chapin\*

Colby and Anne Cogswell\*

Richard Frost\*

Barbara McB. Hamlin\*

Mr. and Mrs. Robert Havilla

Barbara Hazard

Drs. Robert and Alexandra Karriker\*

Marjorie S. Kendall\*

Valerie Kockelman\*

Colonel Don Kosovac\*

John and Helen McCully

Walter Parchomenko\*

Richard and Ramona Peters\*

Maria Sakovich

Prof. and Mrs. Glenn Seaborg\*

Mr. and Mrs. Keith S. Taylor\*

Charles and Katalin V. Tobias

Betty Wells

## Associate Membership

For those of you who are not yet members, we encourage you to join. We believe you will enjoy the stimulating programs; even if you cannot participate as often as you might wish, your continuing contribution critically supports the Center's mission and goals.

**Members (\$50 to \$100).** Members of ASC regularly receive Newsletter "Updates" and special mailings to notify them of last-minute events and special activities, such as cultural performances and major conferences.

**Sponsors (\$100-up).** ASC Sponsors also receive a uniquely designed ceramic mug, promoting Slavic and East European Studies at Berkeley. They also receive invitations to special informal evening talks on campus featuring guest speakers from the faculty as well as visiting scholars.

**Benefactors (\$500-up).** ASC Benefactors will also be our guests at the dinner and evening programs associated with our annual conferences, such as the annual Berkeley-Stanford Conference in the spring. Invitations will be offered, as well, to Benefactors' Meetings. Benefactors will also receive complimentary copies of the books published by the Center on major developments in the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe.

**Center Circle (\$1,000-up).** In addition to enjoying the



above-mentioned benefits, donors within the **Center Circle** will also become Robert Gordon Sproul Associates of the University. As such, they are invited to the Chancellor's annual black tie banquet and to luncheons before the major football games. They also receive membership in the Faculty Club and twenty other worldwide faculty clubs. The names of donors of \$1,000 or more appear in the Annual Report of Private Giving. □



*From page 11*

graduate students in their second or third year. Contact: MacArthur Fellowship Coordinator, Institute of International Studies, 215 Moses Hall, UC Berkeley, campus. The application deadline is **APRIL 4, 1994**.

For summer programs, consult the January issue of the AAASS Newsletter.

**Announcement:**

The 13th annual Yale-Hopkins Summer Seminar for teachers will be held July 11-22. Its theme is "Russian Youth: Past, Present, and Future." For application forms and syllabus, contact: Brian Carter, Yale REES Outreach, P.O. Box 208206, New Haven, CT 06520-8206; (203) 432-3424.

### Associates of the Slavic Center

Send your check, made payable to the Regents of the University of California, to the Center for Slavic and East European Studies, 361 Stephens Hall, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720, Attn: ASC.

Name(s) \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

City \_\_\_\_\_ State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip \_\_\_\_\_

Home Phone \_\_\_\_\_

Business Phone \_\_\_\_\_

If your employer has a matching gift program, please print name of corporation below.

☐ I have made a contribution but wish to remain anonymous.

It is the policy of the University of California, Berkeley, and the University of California, Berkeley Foundation, that a portion of gifts and/or income therefrom is used to defray the costs of raising and administering the funds.

Donations are tax deductible to the extent authorized by law.



# Calendar of Events

Please note: for up-to-date information on Center events, please call (510) 642-3230. Even if no one is available to help you, you can listen to a recorded listing of events that is updated every Friday afternoon.

## Monday, January 31

**BROWN BAG LUNCH:** Alexander J. Motyl, Deputy Director of the Harriman Institute, Columbia University, will discuss the topic, "Will Ukraine Survive 1994?" Co-sponsored by the Berkeley-Stanford Program in Soviet and Post Soviet Studies. 270 Stephens, noon.

## Wednesday, February 9

**BROWN BAG LUNCH:** Veljko Vujacic, Ph.D. candidate in sociology, will discuss "The Russian Right." Mr. Vujacic is currently completing his dissertation on nationalism. His on-site research last year included an interview with Zhirinovskiy. 270 Stephens, noon.

## Friday, February 11

**PUBLIC LECTURE:** Andras Bodrogligeti, professor of Turkic and Iranian languages, Department of Near Eastern Languages, UCLA, addressing the fact that Uzbeks are looking to their history to construct the identity of the new Uzbekistan, will speak on "Islam and the Second Uzbek Empire: Muhammad Shaybani Khan's Thesis of Good Government". Co-sponsored by the Center for Middle Eastern Studies. 270 Stephens, noon.

## Saturday, February 12

**TEACHERS WORKSHOP ON THE NEWLY INDEPENDENT STATES OF CENTRAL ASIA:** Co-sponsored by the Center for Middle Eastern Studies and the World Affairs Council. For more information, call the Council at (415) 982-3263, Middle East Studies at (510) 642-8208, or the Slavic Center, (510) 642-5245. Participation is limited to 75, so please call the Council early to reserve a place. Registration \$10.

## Monday, February 14

**BROWN BAG LUNCH:** Krisztina Morvai, Eotvos Lorand University, will speak on "The Politics of Abortion in East and Central Europe." Location TBA., noon.

## Wednesday, February 16

**BROWN BAG LUNCH:** Vladimir Degoev, professor of history, North Ossetian University, will discuss "Russian Policy in the Caucasus during the 18th and 19th Centuries: New Thinking on the Caucasian War." 270 Stephens, noon.

## Wednesday, February 23

**BROWN BAG LUNCH:** Marat Ametov, Ph.D. candidate in Law, Moscow State University; and Andrei Borsuk, J.D., Far Eastern State University, Vladivostok; two

environmental lawyers from Russia here as part of a program sponsored by the Pacific Environment and Resources Center in Sausalito, will discuss efforts to develop legal strategies for protecting the natural resources of their country. **TO BE CONFIRMED.** 270 Stephens, noon.

## Wednesday, March 2

**BROWN BAG LUNCH:** TBA

## Friday, March 4

**DISCOVER CAL : THE SLAVIC WORLD:** A program for UC Berkeley donors, administered by University Relations, featuring faculty affiliated with the Slavic Center. Invitations will be sent early in the year to Associates and donors. To be held at International House. For more information, call the Center at (510) 643-6205.

## Wednesday, March 9

**BROWN BAG LUNCH:** Bryan Brumley, Correspondent and Knight Fellow, Dept. of Communication, Stanford University, will speak on "Glasnost: the Last Word?" 270 Stephens, noon.

## Monday, March 14

**PUBLIC LECTURE:** Stephen Kotkin, Assistant Professor of History, Princeton University. Time, topic and place TBA. Co-sponsored by the Graduate Group on Built Environments in Soviet Socialism (Architecture and City Planning).

**PUBLIC LECTURE.** Mid March. Date to be announced. Tamara G. Morshchakova, Justice of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation; and Igor Petrukhin, Researcher, Institute of State and Law and member of the drafting committee of the new Constitution of the Russian Federation, will be on the Berkeley campus in mid March. A lecture will be arranged when the dates of their visit are finalized. For further information, call the Center at (510) 643-6205.

**PLEASE NOTE THESE IMPORTANT DATES: Friday, April 8:** The XVIIIth Annual Berkeley-Stanford Conference, at Stanford University. 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. Tresidder Union. Topic TBA.

**Friday, April 15-Sunday, April 17:** Annual Outreach Conference. General theme (title tentative), is "Patterns of Variability in the Post-Communist World: Comparing and Contrasting Developments since 1989." Alumni House. Final program and registration information will be sent out in March. For more information, call the Slavic Center (510) 642-5245.



Center for Slavic and East European Studies  
International and Area Studies  
361 Stephens Hall  
University of California  
Berkeley, CA 94720  
IV 13



---

Non-Profit Org.  
US Postage PAID  
Berkeley, CA  
Permit No. 1

---

**ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED**

Orthodox Institute  
2400 Ridge Road  
Berkeley CA 94709